

OUTP-99-61P

November 1999

hep-th/9911252

What does E_8 know about 11 dimensions ?

IAN I. KOGAN¹ AND JOHN F. WHEATER²

*Department of Physics, University of Oxford
Theoretical Physics,
1 Keble Road,
Oxford OX1 3NP, UK*

Abstract. We discuss some possible relationships in gauge theories, string theory and M theory in the light of some recent results obtained in gauge invariant supersymmetric quantum mechanics. In particular this reveals a new relationship between the gauge group E_8 and 11-dimensional space.

PACS: 11.25.-w, 11.25.Mj

Keywords: M-theory, matrix models, heterotic string

¹e-mail: i.kogan@physics.ox.ac.uk²e-mail: j.wheater@physics.ox.ac.uk

A long time ago it was proposed by Eguchi and Kawai [1] that the dynamics of a four dimensional $SU(N)$ lattice gauge theory at large N could be described by the same $SU(N)$ gauge theory on a single hypercube with periodic boundary conditions. Somehow the extensive nature of space time in such a theory is not important, at least in the large N limit. The Eguchi Kawai model turned out to have a number of problems which required various modifications and it has never yielded a systematic way of solving lattice gauge theories in general. However the idea is clearly appealing, especially in the context of modern developments in which field theories in different numbers of space-time dimensions are related by the compactification of some of the dimensions; the Eguchi Kawai model is simply $SU(N)$ lattice gauge theory compactified on T^4 with the compactification radius sent to zero (or rather one lattice spacing). One practical difficulty with this is precisely that in a lattice theory one cannot continuously vary the compactification radius by changing the lattice size; really we want to keep the lattice size fixed and vary the correlation length so that the size of the box occupied by the continuum effective theory is sent to zero. Perhaps it would be simpler to deal with a continuum theory from the outset. One might suspect that one crucial difference between the modern compactification relations and the Eguchi Kawai model is supersymmetry; this ensures that the energy of the ground state does not diverge under compactification and seems (at least from the technical point of view) to be a vital ingredient in demonstrating the network of dualities relating different string theories and M-theory.

In a recent paper Kac and Smilga [2] have analyzed the zero mode structure of the supersymmetric quantum mechanics (SQM) obtained by dimensionally reducing $D = 3 + 1$ dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ to supersymmetric Yang-Mills field theory (SYM) with gauge group G to $D = 0 + 1$. In turn the $D = 3 + 1$ theory can be regarded as the dimensional reduction of $D = 9 + 1$ $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SYM. The dynamics of this SQM had been first analysed in [3], [4]. The SQM theory is known to have a continuous spectrum with states of all energies E from zero (as guaranteed by supersymmetry) upwards; these states are not normalizable. There is also a discrete spectrum of normalized $E = 0$ states. If the gauge group $G = SU(N)$ then it is known [5] that the SQM Hamiltonian can be regarded as describing the regularized quantum 11-dimensional supermembrane (see for example [6] and references therein) in the light-cone gauge just as ordinary $SU(N)$ QM emerges in the light-cone quantization of the bosonic membrane [7]. It was shown in [8] that the spectrum of $SU(N)$ SQM is continuous which kills the old (i.e. first quantized) supermembrane. However, this is precisely the property which is necessary in a matrix formulation of M-theory [9] where N in $SU(N)$ is related to the number of ‘parton’ $D0$ branes in a light-cone formulation of M-theory in a flat background. More about M-theory and Matrix

theory can be found in [10], [11] and [12] and references therein.

If the SQM is to work as a formulation of M-theory then it is crucial that there is only one $E = 0$ ground state and much effort has gone into investigating this. The proof was given for $SU(2)$ in [13], and a lot of evidence accumulated for $SU(N)$ [14]. Kac and Smilga have now shown that this is indeed the case for all $SU(N)$ and $U(N)$ gauge groups. However their results are much more far reaching and show that the other classical groups, $SO(N)$, $Sp(2r)$, and the exceptional groups, have a much richer structure of $E = 0$ modes.

Consider a $D = d + 1$ SYM theory with the d spatial dimensions forming a compact manifold with isometry group $\mathcal{E}$ and scale (compactification scale) size λ . We can dimensionally reduce the theory to SQM by sending λ to zero. In doing so we lose the isometry group as a symmetry of the theory. However we also create a vector space of n_G $E = 0$ modes which we will denote $\{|0, i\rangle, i = 1 \dots n_G\}$; note that these states are time-independent because $E = 0$ and can therefore be regarded as forming a real vector space not a complex one. A general zero energy state can then be written

$$|X\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n_G} X^i |0, i\rangle. \quad (1)$$

The normalization condition applied to $|X\rangle$ gives the constraint

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_G} X^i X^i \quad (2)$$

and thus the X^i live on the sphere S^{n_G-1} . Thus the destruction of the original isometry group $\mathcal{E}$ by the dimensional reduction is accompanied by the emergence of a new one, $\mathcal{E}' = SO(n_G)$. We propose that if $\mathcal{E} \equiv \mathcal{E}'$ then the process of compactification and reduction is continuous (ie the original d dimensional manifold flows into the new one) and the SQM is equivalent to the original field theory; in this sense such models provide a realization of the Eguchi Kawai idea.

From the rules given by Kac and Smilga we list in Table 1 the simple groups which have (possibly) physically interesting values of n_G . If we dimensionally reduce $D = 3 + 1$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM compactified on S^3 then we see from the table that there are three possible simple G with $n_G = 4$ which will reproduce the S^3 . In addition there is a substantial number of direct products made up from pairs of groups with $n_G = 2$. For $D = 9 + 1$ $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SYM compactified on S^9 there is only one possible simple group, $Sp(20)$, but again many direct product groups with one member taken from the $n_G = 2$ list and the other from the $n_G = 5$ list.

The groups involved in this dimensional reduction do not seem to have any particular physical significance; it could be pure numerology, just a mathematical

n_G	Gauge group G
2	$SO(8), SO(9), SO(10), SO(11), Sp(6), Sp(8), G_2$
3	$SO(12), SO(13), SO(14), Sp(10), E_6$
4	$SO(15), Sp(12), F_4$
5	$SO(16), SO(17), SO(18), Sp(14)$
9	$SO(23)$
10	$Sp(20)$
11	$SO(24), E_8$

game. However, let us now take $D = 10 + 1 = 11$ and we see there are two groups $SO(24)$ and E_8 . We have here a very surprising and striking fact - the group E_8 *knows* about 11 dimensions!

There is a natural place for E_8 in string theory - through the heterotic construction and Narain compactification [16] - roughly speaking this appears as a group with self-dual and even root lattice ³. The fact that these lattices exist in dimensions $0(mod 8)$ fits nicely with the fact that the critical dimensions of bosonic and fermionic strings are 26 and 10 and the difference fits the group $E_8 \times E_8$ (also $SO(32)$ of course, but for $SO(32)$ one may have open strings contrary to $E_8 \times E_8$). The fact that this group can be obtained in closed string theory which is finite guarantees that the Green-Schwarz mechanism [18] of anomaly cancellation works. Let us note that in Narain toroidal compactification of heterotic string on a lattice $\Gamma_{26-d, 10-d}$ with $d < 10$ [17] one may get other groups - but in this case the space has a smaller symmetry $SO(d)$.

Now consider the Horava-Witten construction [19] of heterotic M-theory. Here the ten-dimensional $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string is related to an eleven-dimensional theory on the orbifold $R^{10} \times S^1/Z_2$ and the presence of 10-dimensional boundaries of 11-dimensional space leads to the existence of an E_8 gauge group on each boundary in order to cancel diffeomorphism anomalies. However it seems that E_8 is not directly related to 11 dimensions and knows nothing about the maximal Lorentz group $SO(11)$. But now we should take account of this new information about E_8 SQM. Consider heterotic M-theory on a space $R^1 \times T^9 \times S^1/Z_2$ - each E_8 gauge theory is on a 9-torus T^9 and the R^1 factor is time. Let the radii of the torus be $R_i = \lambda_i R, i = 1 \dots 9$ where the λ_i are conformal factors and consider the limit $R \rightarrow 0$. We get a 1 + 1 dimensional theory on the orbifold S^1/Z_2 . This theory contains the conformal factors of T^9 whose quantum mechanics is trivial, and two-dimensional

³We are not going to discuss $SO(24)$ beyond pointing out that it is the spatial symmetry group of the critical bosonic string in light-cone gauge but the relation between 11 dimensions and bosonic strings is unclear to us for now.

gravity with a copy of E_8 SQM at each of the two singular points on the orbifold. It is tempting to argue that the two-dimensional gravity is non-dynamical and therefore we are just left with the two copies of E_8 SQM each with an $SO(11)$ isometry group on their zero energy normalizable subspace; note that this would not depend on the value R_{11} . If R_{11} is small we have weakly coupled string theory compactified on a shrinking torus, and if it is large we have the strong coupling limit. However it seems to us that the conclusion that there are two $SO(11)$ isometry groups cannot be true and that in fact the gravity must somehow mediate a coupling between the boundaries so that the quantum theory has only one $SO(11)$ symmetry. Our reason for this is a string theory argument that we give in the next paragraph.

String theory on T^9 which is shrunk to a point is T -dual to an infinitely large torus, i.e. essentially R^9 . Since the theory on T^9 is heterotic so is the T -dual theory on R^9 (in contrast to non-heterotic M-theory where $d = 11$ supergravity corresponds to the strongly coupled IIA string [10] and the T -dual transforms it into type IIB). Now under T -duality we have that,

$$R \rightarrow \tilde{R} = \frac{1}{R}, \quad g_s \rightarrow \tilde{g}_s = g_s \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{R}}{R}} = \frac{g_s}{R} \quad (3)$$

so when $R \rightarrow 0$ we see that $\tilde{R} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\tilde{R}_{11} \sim \tilde{g}_s \rightarrow \infty$. Thus string theory arguments show that we should recover the $SO(11)$ symmetry. However if we started from strong coupling from the very beginning we can not apply string arguments, but this is precisely the situation discussed in the previous paragraph.

The group $SO(11)$ we get is hypothetically the full Lorentz group of M-theory. Because the membrane Lorentz algebra is defined in light-cone gauge we have to check that there is full Lorentz invariance just as in a light-cone string theory. The classical Lorentz algebra becomes closed only in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, and quantum-mechanically it is still unknown if $D = 11$ is a critical dimension. Although the full quantum commutator is still unknown, it has been shown that the lowest non-trivial anomalous terms in the commutators $[M^{-i}, M^{-j}]$ are zero [20]. The $SO(11)$ should be an *exact* quantum symmetry. In the case of $R^{10} \times S^1/Z_2$ there is an obvious $SO(10) \times P(10)$ where $P(10)$ denotes the Poincaré symmetry. The full $P(11)$ is broken by the existence of the orbifold planes. This group is nothing but a contraction of the full $SO(11)$; in a picture of two concentric 10-spheres the full $SO(11)$ acts faithfully on the space between them.

If we consider matrix theory on a nine-dimensional torus we have instead of $0+1$ SQM a fully fledged $9+1$ SYM - again this theory only has a maximal $SO(10)$ Lorentz symmetry, but if we add $9+1$ dimensional E_8 theory and reduced the system as a whole again to $0+1$ the full $SO(11)$ symmetry will be produced by the E_8 SQM.

We have argued that the *two* E_8 s should produce only one $SO(11)$. Suppose this is wrong; is there any other interpretation? A generic state for $E_8 \times E_8$ theory has the form

$$|X, Y\rangle = \sum_{i,j=1}^{11} X^i Y^j |0, i\rangle_1 |0, j\rangle_2 = |X\rangle_1 |Y\rangle_2 \quad (4)$$

which looks like we have $R^{11} \times R^{11} = R^{121}$ - not at all what we are looking for. A possible loophole is to consider instead of states $|X\rangle_1 |Y\rangle_2$ operators $|X\rangle\langle Y|$. This simply means that the second Hilbert space we consider as a conjugate to the first one and the quantum mechanical description is given by a *density matrix*

$$\rho(X, Y) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{11} X^i Y^j |0, i\rangle\langle 0, j| \quad (5)$$

This is actually a very nice picture because so far we have no idea how even to start to construct dynamics on this 10-dimensional sphere. But now if we have the space of non-trivial ground states in E_8 providing coordinates, and momenta being the cotangent bundle to this space, we can at least formulate the canonical symplectic form

$$\Omega = dp^i \wedge dq^i \quad (6)$$

and start to develop the dynamics. For normalised wave functions the phase space is going to be $S^{10} \times T^*S^{10}$, so two boundaries of 11-dimensional space in heterotic M-theory play the role of two coordinates in the density matrix $\rho(x + \eta, x - \eta)$ a phase space of some dual theory which has exact $SO(11)$ symmetry. The difference between the coordinates η is parametrised by the tangent bundle to S^{10} and one can see from a Wigner function that a momentum is dual to this difference which justifies the structure of phase space. How to find a Hamiltonian on this phase space and formulate a dynamics is a question which remains to be answered!

We would like to thank André Smilga for telling us about the results of [2] and the PPARC Fast Travel fund for supporting his visit here.

References

- [1] T. Eguchi and H. Kawai, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48 (1982) 1063.
- [2] V.G. Kac and A.V. Smilga, hep-th/9908096.
- [3] M. Claudson and M.B. Halpern, Nucl.Phys. B 250 (1985) 689
- [4] A.V. Smilga, Nucl.Phys. B 266 (1986) 45; Yad.Fiz. 43 (1986) 215

- [5] E.Bergshoeff, E.Sezgin and Y.Tanni, Nucl.Phys. B 298 (1988), 187;
B.de Wit, J.Hoppe and H.Nicolai, Nucl.Phys. B 305 (1988), 545
- [6] E.Bergshoeff, E.Sezgin and P.K. Townsend, Phys.Lett. B189 (1987), 75;
Ann.Phys. 185 (1988) 330;
P.K. Townsend, Phys.Lett. B350 (1995), 184, hep-th/9501068;
- [7] J.Goldstone, unpublished;
J.Hoppe, Ph.D. Thesis, MIT 1982
- [8] B.de Wit, M.Lusher and H.Nicolai, Nucl.Phys. B 320 (1989), 135
- [9] T.Banks, W. Fishler, S.H.Shenker, L.Susskind, Phys.Rev. D55 (1997) 5112
- [10] E. Witten, Nucl.Phys. B443 (1995) 85, hep-th/9503124
- [11] P.K.Townsend , hep-th/9712004;
M.Duff, hep-th/9805177;
H.Nicolai and R. Helling, hep-th/9809103
- [12] T.Banks, hep-th/9710231;
D.Bigatti and L.Susskind, hep-th/9712072
- [13] P.Yi, Nucl.Phys. B 505 (1997), 307, hep-th/9704098;
S.Sethi and M.Stern, Comm.Math.Phys. 194 (1998), 675, hep-th/9705046
- [14] M.Porrati and A.Rozenberg, Nucl.Phys. B515 (1998) 184, hep-th/9708119;
M.B. Gren and M.Gutperle, JHEP 9801 (1998) 005, hep-th/9711107;
G.Moore, N.Nekrasov and S.Shatashvilli, hep-th/9803265
- [15] P. Horava, Nucl.Phys. B505 (1997) 84, hep-th/9705055
- [16] P.G.O. Freund, Phys. Lett. B151 (1985) 387.
D.J. Gross, J.A. Harvey, E. Martinec and R. Rohm, Nucl.Phys. B256 (1985), 253; Nucl.Phys. B267 (1986) 75
- [17] K.S. Narain, Physics. Letters 169B (1986) 41;
K.S. Narain, M.H. Sarmadi and E. Witten, Nucl.Phys. B279 (1987) 369
- [18] M. B. Green and J.H.Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B149 (1984) 117
- [19] P. Horava and E. Witten, Nucl.Phys. B460 (1996) 506, hep-th/9510209;
Nucl.Phys. B475 (1996) 94, hep-th/9603142

[20] D.Lowe, JHEP 9810 (1998) 003, hep-th/9807229